

REMARKS

Applicants request favorable reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the proceeding amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 9, 10, 16, 17, 19, and 21-38 are currently pending, of which claims 16, 22, 26, and 32 are independent. Claims 16 and 22 have been amended, and claims 26-38 are new. Support for the claim amendments and new claims can be found in the original application, as filed. Accordingly, no new matter has been added.

In the Office Action mailed April 6, 2007, claims 9, 10, 16, 17, 21, 22, 24, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0015139 (Hara). Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hara in view of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2001/0001248 (Emoto). Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hara.

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejections and solely to advance prosecution, Applicants have amended independent claims 16 and 22 herein to clarify the distinctions between the invention recited in those claims and the cited art. Applicants submit amended independent claims 16 and 22, as well as new independent claims 26 and 32, are patentable over the cited art for at least the following reasons.

With respect to independent claim 16, the Office Action alleges Hara discloses, *inter alia*, a cooling unit that includes a cooling pipe 203 that is provided in a moving unit 106, 111A, 111B, 65, and 75B, with coolant flowing through the cooling pipe 203 to cool a coil unit 75A

and 75B. The Office Action further alleges Hara discloses supply pipes 203A and 203B for a gas bearing through which a gas flows, with a portion of the supply pipes 203A and 203B disposed adjacent to the cooling pipe 203.

Applicants submit, however, that Hara fails to teach or suggest a supply pipe not connected to a cooling pipe as recited in amended independent claim 16, and also recited in new independent claim 26. Instead, Hara clearly shows pipe 203 as being connected to the pipes 203A and 203B, and discloses that compressed air is supplied from the pipe 203 to the branch pipes 203A and 203B. Hara, Fig. 6 and paragraph [0082]. Thus, the pipes disclosed by Hara, which are equated in the Office Action to a cooling pipe and a supply pipe are connected, unlike the supply pipe and cooling pipe recited in independent claims 16 and 26.

With respect to independent claim 22, the Office Action asserts Hara discloses, *inter alia*, a first moving unit 63 and 64, and a second moving unit 68A that moves with respect to the first moving unit.

Applicants submit, however, Hara does not disclose or suggest the second moving unit to be disposed above the first moving unit, as recited in amended independent claim 22, and also recited in new independent claim 26. In Applicants' view, Hara's first moving unit 63 and 64 and second moving unit 68A are coplanar with each other. See, e.g., Hara, Fig. 4. Thus, the first and second moving units of Hara are disposed in a completely different relationship than the first and second moving units recited in independent claims 22 and 26.

New independent claim 32 recites a stage apparatus that comprises, *inter alia*, a cooling unit that is provided between a coil unit and a supply pipe, with at least a portion of the

supply pipe disposed adjacent to or surrounded by the cooling pipe. Applicants submit that Hara cannot be understood to disclose or suggest such a cooling unit and supply pipe configuration. As shown, for example, in Figs. 1-6 of Hara, the pipes 31A and 203 are not disposed between the coil unit 75A and 75B and the pipes 203A and 203B. Thus, Applicants submit the pipes 31A, 203, 203A, and 203B of Hara, which are equated in the Office Action to be cooling and supply pipes, are configured completely different than the supply and cooling pipes of the present invention, as recited in independent claim 32.

Applicants further submit Emoto cannot be understood to cure any of the deficiencies of Hara. The Office Action cites Emoto as allegedly showing it is known in the art to cause a coolant to flow in a direction opposite to that which a gas flows. However, in Applicants' view, Emoto fails to teach or suggest anything even remotely equating to a gas bearing unit and/or a gas supply pipe, nor does Emoto disclose or suggest a second moving unit. Therefore, Emoto cannot be understood to disclose or suggest the above-noted deficiencies of Hara with respect to independent claims 16, 22, 26, and 32.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit the present invention defined in independent claims 16, 22, 26, and 32 is patentable over the cited art, whether that art is taken individually or in combination.

Dependent claims 9, 10, 17, 19, 21, 23-25, 27-31, and 33-38 also should be deemed allowable in their own right for defining other patentable features of the present invention in addition to those recited the independent claims. Further individual consideration of these dependent claims is requested.

Applicants submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance.

Applicants request favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the Office Action, and a Notice of Allowance.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Donald H. Heckenberg, Jr./

Donald H. Heckenberg, Jr.
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 30,081

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
DHH/lp

FCIS_WS 1475242v1